

A STUDY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

Sunil Yadav

Research Scholar

Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies

Sunilyadavdeva@gmail.com

8368219664s

Dr. Nandini Srivasatava

Professor in-charge Faculty of Management Studies,

Manav Rachna International Institute of Research and Studies

Nandini.fms@mriu.edu.in

9818005624

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to explore the relationship of variables in demographics and employee engagement in the education sector in India. A survey is to be conducted amongst teachers employed in private universities. A Structured questionnaire is used for the collection of data. A sample of 120 teaching faculty staff was taken into consideration. One-way ANOVA, Independent T-Test were used for the analysis of the data. The findings of the study indicate that there is a significant difference between married as well as unmarried to the factors of employee engagement but there is no difference concerning gender. Teaching experience does not significantly impact the teachers' organizational commitment. Age doesn't significantly impact the employee engagement of the teaching staff. The research includes limitations of the studies and exploring the potential scope of further studying the relationship between demographics and employee engagement and other related variables in the education sector in India.

KEYWORDS: Age, Demographics, Experience, Gender, Marital Status, Employee Engagement, Service Sector.

Article Received: 10 August 2020, Revised: 25 October 2020, Accepted: 18 November 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

Every organization now a day works in a competitive environment. In order to stay alive in a competitive business environment every organization needs to focus on the employees. If employees are satisfied with the organization they will be more commitment which means more productivity which ultimately leads to more productivity which means a higher level of performance which leads to more profitability. This can be achieved only when employees are engaged within the organizations. This will lead to overall success for the organization. Though, numerous organizations are not able to accomplish this desired state of engagement, despite capitalizing enormous resources to realize it.

Employee Engagement is one of the most significant factor adding to the increase of organizational productivity, performance as well as long-term existence of business (Nowack, 2006). Organizations that are very much engaged with employee's leads to

give more revenues (Woodruffe, 2006) as well as low turnover (Harter et al. 2002). Employee Engagement directly impacts the employee's productivity which further impacted the efficiency of the organization as a whole. This also becomes accurate for the higher educational institution as they are heavily flooded by human resources. The higher education sector is majorly employee-centric. The literature review has emphasized employee engagement as the major variable for the success of the organization. The examination of literature points out that few studies have been undertaken on sides of employee engagement and demographic characteristics. This study addresses this gap.

2. Review

Employee engagement is a priceless concept in the direction of many characteristics of an individual and organizational performance. Kahn defined engagement as employees working in organizations

bind themselves to their jobs, people engage themselves in work and define themselves substantially, cognitively, expressively, and psychologically during the job (Schaufeli, 2012). Kahn (1990) outlines employee engagement as "*the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances*" p.694.

There are three dimensions of employee engagement that is vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor refers to a positive influence defined by the high levels of positive energy and employees' psychological flexibility when performing job duties (Kataria et al., 2013). Dedication refers to the element of motivation, which considers the perspective of employee engagement in terms of importance and job results (Kataria et al., 2013). Absorption refers to the cognitive dimension defined by the employee's involvement in their jobs to the degree that it is difficult for one to shed oneself from jobs (Kataria et al., 2013).

Some of the Studies have linked employee engagement with numerous favorable organizational consequences like increase in productivity, loyalty, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, decrease in employee turnover, occupational accidents, and improved health as well as wellness outcomes and customer satisfaction (Nienaber& Martins 2015a).

Cheche, Muathe&Maina, (2019), in their study, found that employee engagement significantly influences organizational performance, as well as the relationship between the two is moderated by age, education, and tenure.

The measurement of work engagement, Schaufeli, and Bakker (2004) developed the self-report Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES). Vigour, dedication, and absorption are measured by 6, 5, and 6 items, respectively. It is a 17-item scale known as the UWES-17 and has been validated and utilized in various countries, including India. Outcomes have represented that the UWES-17 has sufficient internal consistencies, ranging between 0.80 and 0.90 (Schaufeli, Salanova, Romá& Bakker, 2002).

Various types of research point out the combined results of the relationship between gender and employee engagement. Many of them have released that the level of engagement is higher among that women as compared to men (Rothbard, 1999; Shukla, Adhikari& Singh, 2015), while on the other hand, many of the levels of engagement are higher among that men as compare to women while some of them found that there is no difference in the level of engagement among men and women.

Swaminathan and Ananth (2012) found that employee engagement is greatly affected by all employees' demographic characteristics, income, and experience. The authors also observed that workers with more experience and higher salaries are more committed and active than others in carrying out their jobs. One of the studies also indicates that employee involvement has a favorable association with years of experience, and more seasoned workers are more involved (Jaupi&Llaci, 2015).

Shukla, Adhikari& Singh, 2015 in their study, have found that there are significant differences in the score of engagement for the demographic variables that include gender, marital status, and experience. They also found that high engagement levels of married and senior employees.

Schaufeli, Bakker &Salanova, (2006) employed a large sample of employees and clarified that both age and engagement are positively related, even though the relationship between them was too weak to be considered significant. However, many studies show that older workers are more engaged than their younger coworkers (James, McKechnie&Swanberg, 2011; Pitt-Catsoupes and Matz-Costa 2008).

Previous literature conducted by various researcher like (Eker et al., 2004; Jaupi, &Llaci, 2015; Kahn, 1990; Maslach& Leiter, 2008) gives importance to the demographic variables to take into consideration and focused lack of research evidence concluding demographic variables. This study was conducted to examine the effect of demographic variables (age, gender, marital status, and years of teaching experience) on employee engagement as no such research is being conducted in the higher education sector, especially in India.

3. Hypothesis

The following hypothesis is formulated:

Null Hypothesis 1: There is no insignificantrelationship between gender and employee engagement.

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant relationship between age and employee engagement.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant relationship between Marital Status and employee engagement.

Null Hypothesis 4: There is no significant relationship between year of experience and employee engagement.

4. Research methodology

The research descriptive research. The Data was collected in the period of March-August 2020. The Data was collected in the Delhi/ NCR Region of India from 120 respondents working in the higher education sector. A simple random sampling method is used for the collection of data. The questionnaire is

categorised into two parts. Part A consist of questions associated to the respondents' demographic profile, and Part B includes questions associated to employee engagement. The structured questionnaire was given by Schaufeli & Bakker (2004) UTRECHT WORK ENGAGEMENT SCALE item having 17 statements like "When I am working, I forget everything else around me," "I am proud on the work that I do" were used for the research. The Likert scale 5-point scale, starting from 1, implies strongly dissatisfied to 5 implies strongly satisfied is applied for the research. SPSS 23.0 is used for data analysis. To test the hypothesis, the researcher has used descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA test and independent t-test.

5. Analysis of Data

5.1. Demographic characteristics of teachers

The demographic characteristics of the teachers is indicated in table 5.2. The table comprises the teachers' age, gender, marital status, teaching experience, courses taught, and department.

Age: The age group of 31-35 years constitutes most teachers (n=47, 39.2%) on the other hand, age group of 26-30 years (n=39, 32.5%). Likewise age group of 36-40 years got (n=12, 10%), age group of 20-25 years has (n=9, 7.5%), age group of 46-45 year has (n=7, 5.8%) and age group of 41-45 years indicates the lowest (n=6, 5%). The younger teachers under the group of 31-35 constitute the majority of teachers with 39.2%, while older teachers under the group of 41-45 consist of 5%

Gender: Majority of teachers are female (n= 54, 45%) form the total sample, as compared to males

(n= 66, 55%), which means female teachers' contribution is more.

Marital Status: Most teachers are married (n=78, 65%) and unmarried (n=42, 35%). It means most of the faculties are married.

Teaching Experience: Teachers who have (1-20) years of experience constitute 88.3 % (8.3+35+37.5+7.5), where teachers who have (21-30) years of experience constitute 11.6% (5.8+5.8). It means most of the faculty teachers are of the younger population.

Course taught: Majority of teachers are taking classes of both UG & PG programs (n=84, 70%) while teachers taking UG programs (n=14, 11.7%) and only PG programs (n=22, 18.3%). Most of the teachers are taking both UG and PG subjects.

Department of teaching: Majority of teachers are from the Department of Management, Department of Sciences, Arts, Law, and Engineering 83.4% (31.7+11.7+18.3+7.5+14.2) while other 16.6 % of teachers belong to the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Medical Sciences, Hospitality, Architecture. Most of the respondents belong to the Department of Management.

5.2 Reliability

The reliability of the data was checked using Cronbach's α is shown in table 5.2. The outcomes indicate that the values of Cronbach's α for employee engagement are .880, which is under the acceptable limit as per Nunnally, 1978, the acceptable limit for reliability is above .70. Therefore reliability is acceptable.

Table: 5.2: Data reliability

Cronbach's α	N
.880	17

5.4 Statistical Significance Test

The T-test is used to prove the hypothesis H1 and H3. The outcomes are displayed in table 5.3. The results point out that since the p-value is < 0.05, the null hypothesis 3 is rejected at 5% level of significance

for marital status (p-value =.042). Hence, there is a significant difference between married as well as unmarried to the factors of employee engagement. But there is no difference concerning gender (.353), and the null hypothesis (H1) is accepted.

Table 5.3: T- Test for significant difference between Gender and Marital Status

Demographic variable	Category	Sample (n)	Employee engagement		T-Value	p Value
			Mean	Std dev.		
Gender	Male	54	51.3333	7.48331	.011	0.353
	Female	66	54.2273	7.49522		
Marital Status	Married	78	52.5385	8.20309	.366	.042
	Unmarried	42	53.6429	6.35081		

Note: Significance at 5% Level

5.6 One-way ANOVA for significant differences among impact of age and teaching experience

Table 5.4 represents that employee engagement was higher among the teachers from an age of 31-35 years and lowest in the age of 41-45 years. Further, f -Value was found to be 1.252 at a p -value of .290, which indicates no significant difference in teachers' mean values based on age. Therefore, it was found that age doesn't significantly impact the employee engagement of the teaching staff. Hence, we agree to take the Null Hypothesis (H1) and castoff the alternate. Furthermore, table 5.4 represents that

employee engagement was higher among the teachers having an experience of 11-15 years and lowest among the teachers having an experience of 21-25 and 26-30 years.

Further, f -Value was found to be 1.133 at a p -value of .347, indicating no significant difference in teachers' mean values based on experience. Therefore, it can be said that experience does not significantly impact the teachers' organizational commitment. Hence, we agree to take the Null Hypothesis (H4) and castoff the alternate.

Table 5.4: One-way ANOVA for significant differences among impact of age and teaching experience

Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
20-25 Years	9	55.6667	5.02494	1.67498
26-30 Years	39	52.8462	6.79992	1.08886
31-35 Years	47	52.1064	8.65080	1.26185
36-40 Years	12	50.3333	6.95875	2.00882
41-45 Years	6	56.8333	8.06019	3.29056
46-50 Years	7	56.4286	6.47707	2.44810
Total	120	52.9250	7.59717	.69352
F value=1.252, p value=.290				
Teaching Experience	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
1-5 Years	10	55.4000	4.81202	1.52169
6-10 Years	42	52.8571	6.53908	1.00900
11-15 Years	45	52.1556	8.86247	1.32114
16-20 Years	9	49.5556	7.76388	2.58796
21-25 Years	7	55.5714	8.07996	3.05394
26-30 Years	7	56.4286	6.47707	2.44810
Total	120	52.9250	7.59717	.69352
F value=1.133, p value=.347				

6. CONCLUSIONS

Employee engagement is an endless practice. The study found significant differences concerning age and teaching experience age don't significantly impact the employee engagement of the teaching staff. However, there is a significant difference between married as well as unmarried to employee engagement factors. But there is no difference concerning gender.

Every research has some limitations also. This study mainly focuses on the demographic aspects related to employee engagement. The study respondents were only faculty members working in private universities in Delhi-NCR region only. It could be done in other

sectors and a larger section of the population that can be taken into account like banking and insurance, IT sector, etc. to check the impact of employee engagement. The study could be done taking more variables into account as well.

7. Limitation and scope of the study

Every research has some limitations. The first, limitation of the study is this study is cross-sectional. It reduces the generalization of the research. It could be a longitudinal study that increases the generalizations of the result. The second limitation is the sample size is small concerning a particular region; the area could be large, which gives more reliable results. The third limitation is this study

covering the higher education sector. Focus can be put more on other sectors also. The fourth limitation is that only one variable is taken into account. The study can be conducted considering more variables.

REFERENCE

1. Bedarkar, M., & Pandita, D. (2014). A study of drivers of employee engagement impacting employee performance. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 133, 106–115. Doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.174
2. Cahill, K. E., McNamara, T. K., Pitt-Catsouphes, M., & Valcour, M. (2015). Linking shifts in the national economy with changes in job satisfaction, employee engagement, and work life balance. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 56, 40–54. doi:10.1016/j.socec.2015.03.002
3. Cheche, S. G., Muathe, S. M., & Maina, S. M. (2019). Employee engagement, demographic characteristics and performance of state research and training corporations in Kenya. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18(1), 55–70.
4. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(2), 268.
5. James, J. B., McKechnie, S., & Swanberg, J. (2011). Predicting employee engagement in an age-diverse retail workforce. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. doi:10.1002/job.681
6. Jaupi, F., & Llaci, S. (2015). The impact of communication satisfaction and demographic variables on employee engagement. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 8(02), 191. Doi:10.4236/jssm.2015.82021
7. Jeve, Y. B., Oppenheimer, C., & Konje, J. (2015). Employee engagement within NHS: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 4(2), 85–90. doi:10.15171/ijhpm.2015.12
8. Kataria, A., Rastogi, R., & Garg, P. (2013). Organizational effectiveness as a function of employee engagement. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 20(4), 56–73. Retrieved from <http://www.amdisa.org>
9. Kahn W A (1990), “Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work”, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 692–724.
10. Mohapatra, M., & Sharma, B. R. (2010). Study of employee engagement and its predictors in an Indian public sector undertaking. *Global Business Review*, 11(2), 281–301.
11. Nowack, K. (2006). Employee engagement, job satisfaction, retention and stress. Retrieved from: www.envisialearning.com, accessed during April 2011
12. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill
13. Pitt-Catsouphes, M., & Matz-Costa, C. D. (2008). The multi-generational workforce: findings from the age & generations study. Issue brief No. 20. Chestnut Hill: Sloan Center on Aging & Work at Boston College. https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/agingandwork/pdf/publications/IB20_Engagement.pdf
14. Rothbard, N. (1999) ‘Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family’. *Dissertation Abstracts International US: University Microfilms International*, 59 (10-A).
15. Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Romá, V.G. & Bakker, A.B. 2002. The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout: a Confirmative Analytic Approach. 3, 71–92.
16. Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2004). UWES – Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, Preliminary manual [Version 1]. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit*, Utrecht University.
17. Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: a cross-national study. Educational and Psychological Measurement. doi:10.1177/0013164405282471.
18. Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Work engagement. What do we know and where do we go? *Romanian Journal of Applied Psychology*, 14, 3–10. Retrieved from <http://www.rjap.psihologietm.ro>
19. Shukla, S., Adhikari, B., & Singh, V. (2015). Employee engagement-role of demographic variables and personality factors. *Amity global HRM review*, 5, 65–73.
20. Stephanie, 2016. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test for Sampling Adequacy. Available from <https://www.statisticshowto.datasciencecentral.com/kaiser-meyer-olkin/>
21. Swaminathan J. and Ananth A. (2012). Impact Of Demographic Factors On Employee Engagement - A Study With Reference To Vasan Publications Private Limited, Chennai, Online at <http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/39768/> MPRA Paper No. 39768, posted 2. July 2012 19:19 UTC.